

Robert G. Abrams  
 Thomas A. Isaacson  
 Peter A. Barile III  
 HOWREY LLP  
 1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
 Washington, DC 20004  
 Tel.: (202) 783-0800  
 Fax: (202) 383-6610  
 abramsr@howrey.com  
 isaacsont@howrey.com  
 barilep@howrey.com

Paul Alexander  
 HOWREY LLP  
 1950 University Avenue  
 East Palo Alto, CA 94303  
 Tel.: (650) 798-3500  
 Fax: (650) 798-3600  
 alexanderp@howrey.com

Emily L. Maxwell  
 HOWREY LLP  
 525 Market Street, Suite 3600  
 San Francisco, CA 94105  
 Tel.: (415) 848-4947  
 Fax: (415) 848-4999  
 maxwelle@howrey.com

*Counsel for Plaintiffs Andrea Resnick, et al.*  
 [Additional counsel on signature page]

Jonathan M. Jacobson  
 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI, PC  
 1301 Avenue of the Americas, 40th Floor  
 New York, NY 10019  
 Tel.: (212) 999-5800  
 Fax: (212) 999-5899  
 jjacobson@wsgr.com  
 swalsh@wsgr.com

*Counsel for Defendant Netflix, Inc.*

Neal Manne  
 SUSMAN GODFREY LLP  
 1000 Louisiana Street, Suite 5100  
 Houston, Texas 77002  
 Tel: (713) 651-9366  
 Fax: (713) 654-6666  
 nmanne@susmangodfrey.com

*Counsel for Defendants Wal-Mart Stores, Inc, et al.*  
 [Additional counsel on signature page]

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

Andrea Resnick et al. v. Walmart.com, et al.  
 (Case No. C 09-0002 PJH)  
 Michael O'Connor v. Walmart.com, et al.  
 (Case No. C 09-0096 PJH)  
 Sarah Endzweig v. Walmart.com, et al.  
 (Case No. C 09-0111 PJH)  
 Christopher Schmitz v. Walmart.com, et al.  
 (Case No. C 09-0116 PJH)  
 Scott Lynch, et al. v. Walmart.com, et al.  
 (Case No. C 09-0138 PJH)  
 Jonathan Groce, et al. v. Netflix, Inc., et al.  
 (Case No. C 09-0139 PJH)  
 Liza Sivek v. Walmart.com, et al.  
 (Case No. C 09-0156 PJH)

**Related Case File No. C 09-0002 PJH**

**JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT**

**Date: April 9, 2009**  
**Time: 1:30 p.m.**  
**Courtroom 3, 17th Floor**

**Hon. Phyllis J. Hamilton**

JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT

1	Armond Faris v. Netflix, Inc., et al. (Case No. C 09-0180 PJH)	
2	Suzanne Slobodin v. Netflix, Inc., et al. (Case No. C 09-0225 PJH)	
3	Katherine Anthony, et al. v. Walmart.com, et al. (Case No. C 09-0236 PJH)	
4	Melanie Polk-Stamps v. Netflix, Inc., et al. (Case No. C 09-0244 PJH)	
5	Richard Sheeler, Jr. v. Walmart.com, et al. (Case No. C 09-0274 PJH)	
6	Cathleen Chapman v. Netflix, Inc., et al. (Case No. C 09-0294 PJH)	
7	Michael Orozco v. Netflix, Inc., et al. (Case No. C 09-0297 PJH)	
8	Linda Landels, et al. v. Netflix, Inc., et al. (Case No. C 09-0340 PJH)	
9	Sarah Grime v. Netflix, Inc., et al. (Case No. C 09-0349 PJH)	
10	Douglas Meyer v. Walmart.com, et al. (Case No. C 09-0361 PJH)	
11	Laura Randall v. Walmart.com, et al. (Case No. C 09-0368 PJH)	
12	Frank Hirsch v. Netflix, Inc., et al. (Case No. C 09-0375 PJH)	
13	Melanie Miscioscia v. Netflix, Inc., et al. (Case No. C 09-0377 PJH)	
14	James Chatelain v. Netflix, Inc., et al. (Case No. C 09-0391 PJH)	
15	Patras v. Netflix, Inc., et al. (Case No. C 09-00378 PJH)	
16	Weiner v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al. (Case No. C 09-00398 PJH)	
17	Millrood v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al. (Case No. C 09-00399 PJH)	
18	Kober v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al. (Case No. C 09-00400 PJH)	
19	Lacabe v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al. (Case No. C 09-00402 PJH)	
20	Roy v. Netflix, Inc., et al. (Case No. C 09-00434 PJH)	
21	Bruno, et al. v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al. (Case No. C 09-00445 PJH)	
22	Zaker v. Netflix, Inc., et al. (Case No. C 09-00447 PJH)	
23	Parikh v. Netflix, Inc., et al. (Case No. C 09-00496 PJH)	
24	Johnson v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al. (Case No. C 09-00553 PJH)	
25		
26		
27		
28		

HOWREY LLP

Gannon v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al.  
(Case No. C 09-00554 PJH)  
Williams v. Netflix, Inc., et al.  
(Case No. C 09-00678 PJH)  
Haddad v. Netflix, Inc., et al.  
(Case No. C-09-00958 PJH)  
Wiebe v. Netflix, Inc., et al.  
(Case No. C-09-01274 PJH)  
Norem v. Netflix, Inc., et al.  
(Case No. C-09-00956 PJH)  
Cornett v. Netflix, Inc., et al.  
(Case No. C-09-00960 PJH)  
Macias v. Netflix, Inc., et al.  
(Case No. C-09-00961 PJH)  
Randle v. Netflix, Inc., et al.  
(Case No. C 09-00962-PJH)

Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 16-9 and the Court's order of February 2, 2009, as well as the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rules 16(b) & 26(f), all Parties to the above-captioned actions hereby submit this Joint Case Management Statement in advance of the April 9, 2009 Case Management Conference.

## **1. JURISDICTION AND SERVICE**

### **a. Plaintiffs' Statement<sup>1</sup>**

This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§1331 & 1337 and 15 U.S.C. §§1-2, 15 & 26. There are no personal jurisdiction issues for any of the Defendants. All Defendants have been served with a summons in one or more of the actions, or their respective counsel have stipulated to accept service on their behalf. Counsel for Defendants have agreed to accept service of the Consolidated Amended Complaint on behalf of their clients.

---

<sup>1</sup> Unless specifically stated to the contrary, any statement of "Plaintiffs" herein represents the agreed statement of all Plaintiffs who have filed cases in the Northern District of California.

1                   **b.       Statement of the California Cartwright Act State Court Plaintiffs**

2                   On behalf of the state plaintiffs' counsel, all firms with cases recently removed from Santa  
3 Clara County, California by Defendant Walmart.com USA, LLC,<sup>2</sup> (the "Cartwright Act Cases" or  
4 "state cases") unanimously recommend that the Court first hear and consider any motions to remand  
5 any Cartwright Act Case as soon the Court is able to calendar the remand motion. Plaintiffs in the lead  
6 Cartwright Act Case *Norem*, in conjunction with the other state cases, have filed with this Court a  
7 motion to remand all the improperly removed Cartwright Act Cases and noticed a hearing for May 13,  
8 2009.  
9

10                  Plaintiffs believe that the motion to remand will be granted, and therefore no motion to  
11 consolidate the Cartwright Act Cases with the federal cases should be permitted. The Cartwright Act  
12 Plaintiffs do not oppose the consolidation of the numerous non-Cartwright Act federal claims cases,  
13 but consolidation of the improperly removed Cartwright Act Cases with the federal claims cases is  
14 unnecessary at this time. After conferring with Plaintiffs' counsel in the non-Cartwright Act federal  
15 claims cases, the federal claims plaintiffs have stated that they have no interest in consolidating their  
16 non-Cartwright Act federal claims cases with the Cartwright Act Cases.  
17

18                  If the remand motion is denied, counsel for the Cartwright Act Cases will provide appropriate  
19 recommendations to this Court. Regardless of venue, the state plaintiffs counsel intend to coordinate  
20 the prosecution of the Cartwright Act Cases with the federal claims cases, as provided for in the  
21

---

22  
23       <sup>2</sup> The Cartwright Act Cases are as follows: JAMES NOREM, on behalf of himself and others  
24 similarly situated, Plaintiff, v. NETFLIX, INC. and WALMART.COM USA, LLC, Defendants,  
25 District Court Case No.CV-09-00956-PJH (Case No. 1-09-CV-133576, Santa Clara Superior  
26 Court); OSCAR MACIAS, on behalf of himself and others similarly situated, Plaintiff, v.  
27 NETFLIX, INC. and WALMART.COM USA, LLC, Defendants, District Court Case No.CV-09-  
28 00961-PJH (Case No. 1-09-CV-133878,Santa Clara Superior Court); JIM CORNETT, on behalf  
of himself and others similarly situated, Plaintiff, v. NETFLIX, INC. and WALMART.COM  
USA, LLC, Defendants, District Court Case No. CV-09-00960-PJH (Case No. 1-09-CV-134759,  
Santa Clara Superior Court); and JESSE RANDLE, on behalf of himself and others similarly  
situated, Plaintiff, v. NETFLIX, INC. and WALMART.COM USA, LLC, Defendants, District  
(Continued...)

1 *Manual for Complex Litigation, Fourth*, § 20.3 (2006) (and as proposed to Defendants prior to removal  
2 of the state cases by the Walmart Defendant). Due to the uniqueness of the claims asserted in their  
3 complaints, including causes of action under California Business and Professions Code Section 17200  
4 et. seq., the Cartwright Act Plaintiffs would vigorously oppose any attempt to stay their cases either  
5 here or in state court were the cases remanded. In all other respects, the Cartwright Act Plaintiffs have  
6 no objection to the federal claims plaintiffs' proposal with respect to pretrial issues as set forth in their  
7 respective sections of this Joint Statement.  
8

9  
10 **c. Defendants' Statement**

11 Defendants agree that this Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§1331  
12 & 1337 and that this Court has personal jurisdiction over the Defendants. Defendants have been  
13 served or have waived service in some, but not all, the related actions. Counsel for Defendants hereby  
14 agree to accept service of the Consolidated Amended Complaint on behalf of their clients. With  
15 respect to the California Cartwright Act actions that have been removed from state court and are now  
16 pending in this Court, a response to the motion to remand will be filed at an appropriate time.  
17 Defendants note that the named plaintiffs and each member of the proposed classes in the California  
18 Cartwright Act actions is also a member of the proposed classes in the previously filed actions pending  
19 in this Court, and that the Cartwright Act claims alleged in the state court actions are identical to the  
20 Sherman Act claims alleged in the previously filed actions. Accordingly, regardless of where the  
21 Cartwright Act actions are venued, defendants will seek a stay of those actions in deference to the  
22 previously filed actions (or, in the alternative, consolidation with the previously filed actions). A  
23 number of additional related actions have been filed in state court; if any such actions remain in state  
24 court there will be a need to coordinate discovery and other proceedings with those actions.  
25

26 \_\_\_\_\_  
27 (...Continued)

28 Court Case No. CV-09-0962-PJH (Case No. 1-09-CV-134921, Santa Clara Superior Court).

1 **2. FACTS**

2 **a. Plaintiffs' Statement**

3 On or about May 19, 2005, Netflix, Wal-Mart Stores, and Walmart.com, a wholly owned  
4 subsidiary of Wal-Mart Stores, entered into a *per se* illegal conspiratorial agreement to divide the  
5 markets for the sales and online rentals of DVDs in the United States ("Market Division Agreement"),  
6 with the purpose and effect of monopolizing and unreasonably restraining trade in the Online DVD  
7 Rental Market in the United States in violation of Sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Antitrust Act, 15  
8 U.S.C., §§ 1-2. The agreement is illegal even if analyzed under some standard other than *per se*  
9 illegality, such as the rule of reason.

10 The meetings that led to the illegal conspiracy began as early as January 2005, when Reed  
11 Hastings, the CEO of Netflix, called John Fleming, then the CEO of Walmart.com, to invite him to  
12 dinner to discuss the online DVD rental and DVD sales markets. At the time (and to this day), Wal-  
13 Mart and Netflix were far and away the dominant leaders in the markets for DVD sales and online  
14 rentals, respectively, with Wal-Mart controlling about 40% of all DVD sales in the U.S. and Netflix  
15 having about a 75% market share of online DVD rentals in the U.S. Fleming, who reported directly to  
16 Wal-Mart Stores' CEO Lee Scott, accepted Hastings' invitation; the two thereafter met and, as a result  
17 of the meetings and exchanges that followed, Defendants entered into the alleged illegal conspiracy to  
18 divide the markets for the sales of DVDs and online rentals of DVDs.

19 At the time of their initial meeting and prior to entering into the Market Division Agreement,  
20 Netflix and Walmart.com were direct competitors in renting DVDs online, and all three Defendants  
21 were potential competitors in selling new DVDs to consumers. Under the Market Division Agreement,  
22 however, Netflix, Wal-Mart Stores, and Walmart.com agreed that Walmart.com would stop competing  
23 with Netflix in the online rental market. Netflix agreed that it would not sell new DVDs, as it was  
24 well-positioned and otherwise had the unilateral economic incentive to do, but instead would promote  
25 the DVD sales of Wal-Mart Stores and Walmart.com. Since entering into the Market Division  
26 Agreement, neither Wal-Mart Stores nor Walmart.com has rented DVDs online and Netflix has not  
27 sold new DVDs. As a result of the Market Division Agreement among competitors, Netflix was able  
28 to charge higher prices for its DVD rental subscriptions and, in fact, did so. The Market Division

1 Agreement also served to entrench and enhance Defendants' dominant market positions and otherwise  
2 cause harm to competition, including enabling Netflix to charge higher subscription prices for online  
3 DVD rentals than it would have had they not entered into the agreement. Plaintiffs and all other  
4 similarly situated consumers in fact paid higher subscription prices to Netflix.

5 This case is brought as a class action on behalf of all consumers in the United States who,  
6 during the period May 19, 2005 to the present, paid a subscription fee to rent DVDs from Netflix.  
7 Plaintiffs bring this action on behalf of themselves and other similarly situated consumers nationwide  
8 under Sections 4 and 16 of the Clayton Antitrust Act. Plaintiffs seek redress in the form of treble  
9 damages and other relief for their injuries resulting from Defendants' violations of law and seek a  
10 declaration that the Market Division Agreement is null and void.

11 **b. Defendants' Statement**

12 The May 2005 agreement between Netflix and Walmart.com that plaintiffs have labeled a "*per*  
13 *se* illegal conspiratorial" agreement or "Market Division Agreement" was, in fact, a perfectly legal  
14 joint promotion agreement relating to online DVD rentals. The joint promotion agreement was lawful,  
15 not "*per se* illegal"; it was publicly announced and widely reported in the popular press, not  
16 "conspiratorial"; and it involved only a failed Walmart.com DVD rental business venture that had well  
17 less than 1% of online DVD rental subscribers, not the "division" of markets for DVD rentals and  
18 DVD sales alleged by Plaintiffs' complaints. In short, Defendants believe that Plaintiffs' case is  
19 grounded on fundamentally false factual premises, and, accordingly, have proposed a schedule under  
20 which the core issue of whether the joint promotion agreement may be considered a *per se* illegal  
21 "Market Division Agreement" would be determined through an early summary judgment motion after  
22 an early period of fact discovery in which Plaintiffs would be afforded a fair opportunity to test their  
23 theory that Wal-Mart and Netflix unlawfully conspired to divide the markets for online DVD rentals  
24 and DVD sales.

25 In May 2005, Netflix and Walmart.com entered into a joint promotion agreement relating to  
26 online DVD rentals. At the time, Walmart.com had fewer than 150,000 online DVD rental  
27 subscribers, a share of well less than 1% even under the relevant market alleged by Plaintiffs (which,  
28 Defendants believe, is far too narrow as it does not adequately account for competition from other

1 sources). Netflix had built an online DVD rental business with a rapidly growing base of several  
2 million subscribers, and faced intense competition from its leading competitor Blockbuster (the leading  
3 “brick and mortar” DVD rental company and a recent entrant in online DVD rentals) and others, as  
4 well as potential competition from Amazon.com and other online DVD rental entrants. Based on the  
5 extremely limited success and future prospects for its online DVD rental business, and recognizing that  
6 its resources could be better deployed elsewhere, Walmart.com decided to discontinue that business,  
7 and held discussions with Netflix about how best to transition its customers to Netflix when it did so.  
8 Those discussions ultimately led to the joint promotion agreement, under which Walmart.com agreed  
9 to refer its existing online DVD rental customers to Netflix.

10 Contrary to Plaintiffs’ allegation that the joint promotion agreement was “conspiratorial,” the  
11 joint promotion agreement was publicly announced through a joint press release and was reported in  
12 numerous publications. The Federal Trade Commission was aware of the agreement, and pursued no  
13 action. For more than three and a half years, no one claimed that there was anything wrong with the  
14 joint promotion agreement, let alone that it somehow constituted a *per se* violation of the antitrust  
15 laws. Nonetheless, earlier this year, the *Resnick* complaint was filed in this Court, alleging that the  
16 joint promotion agreement was in fact a “market division agreement” whereby Walmart.com and  
17 Netflix had agreed to allocate the markets for online DVD rentals and DVD sales, and that this alleged  
18 “market division agreement” was illegal *per se*. The *Resnick* action spawned more than fifty virtually  
19 identical complaints in courts throughout the country, each brought on behalf of a putative class of  
20 online DVD rental subscribers.

21 Plaintiffs’ core allegation is that Netflix and Walmart.com agreed to a *per se* illegal market  
22 division agreement, pursuant to which Walmart.com agreed to exit the market for online DVD rentals  
23 while Netflix agreed to exit the market for DVD sales. On their face, Plaintiffs’ antitrust claims hinge  
24 on the existence of that market division agreement. Unfortunately for Plaintiffs, however, the alleged  
25 agreement did not exist. The published news stories that serve as the basis for Plaintiffs’ claims  
26 contain no reference to it. In fact, there is no agreement restricting Netflix’s ability to launch a DVD  
27 sales business should it choose to do so, and nothing in the joint promotion agreement between Netflix  
28 and Walmart.com restricts Walmart.com’s ability to re-enter the online DVD rental business should it



1 choose to do so. Rather, the joint promotion agreement is a perfectly lawful and uncontroversial  
2 transaction that was entered into for legitimate business reasons and that benefitted consumers by  
3 providing Walmart.com's small number of online DVD rental subscribers a smooth mechanism for  
4 transitioning to Netflix, if they wanted to do so, as Walmart.com chose to exit the market.

5 The joint promotion agreement provided significant benefits to customers and eliminated no  
6 competition that would otherwise have existed. Walmart.com's presence in online DVD rentals  
7 provided no constraint on Netflix pricing. That pricing, instead, was constrained by pay-per-view and  
8 digital video recordings via cable and satellite, online video-on-demand, sales of new and used DVDs,  
9 Blockbuster Online, the threat of entry from Amazon.com, and numerous other factors. The joint  
10 promotion agreement provided benefits to Walmart.com DVD rental subscribers by providing them  
11 with a replacement service provider in the wake of Walmart.com's prior decision to depart from this  
12 segment of the business.

13 For those and other reasons, Defendants contend that Plaintiffs antitrust claims are without  
14 merit.

### 16 **3. LEGAL ISSUES**

#### 17 **a. Plaintiffs' Statement**

18 Plaintiffs believe that the primary legal issues include, but are not limited to, the following:

19 i. Whether Defendants' alleged contract, combination, and conspiracy violated  
20 Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1;

21 ii. Whether the alleged contract, combination, and conspiracy violated Section 2 of  
22 the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 2; and

23 iii. Whether the action may be maintained as a class action pursuant to Rule 23 of  
24 the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

#### 25 **b. Defendants' Statement**

26 In addition to those legal issues indicated above, Defendants believe that these additional legal  
27 issues will be primary:  
28

i. Whether Plaintiffs have stated a claim for which relief can be granted for violation of sections 1 or 2 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 1, 2;

ii. Whether the relevant markets alleged in the complaints are the proper markets for assessing Plaintiffs' antitrust claims under sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 1, 2;

iii. Whether there is any basis for Plaintiffs' claim that Netflix, on the one hand, and Walmart.com and Wal-Mart Stores, on the other, entered into a *per se* illegal market division agreement whereby Walmart.com agreed to exit the online DVD rental business in exchange for an agreement by Netflix not to enter the DVD sales business;

iv. Whether the joint promotion agreement may be found unlawful under the rule of reason governing Plaintiffs' antitrust claims, in light of the fact that it affected less than 1% of even the unduly narrow relevant market alleged by Plaintiffs, in light of Walmart.com's independent and legitimate reasons for choosing to discontinue its online DVD rental business, in light of the absence of any prior competitive constraint from the Walmart.com DVD online rental business on the pricing of DVD rentals, and in light of the procompetitive benefits of the agreement to Walmart.com online DVD rental subscribers;

v. Whether Plaintiffs can show that the joint promotion agreement had any effect on prices or competition in online DVD sales and can demonstrate any such effect on a class-wide basis.

#### 4. MOTIONS

##### a. Joint Statement

There have been several related case motions and stipulations to extend the time in which Defendants may answer or otherwise respond to the various related complaints, all of which have been granted in this Court. Aside from the motion to remand in the California Cartwright Act actions noted above, there are no pending motions in this Court, although there is a proceeding pending before the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation as set forth in Item 14, below.

1 Plaintiffs intend to file a motion for class certification. The proposed timing for filing a motion  
2 for class certification is set forth in (a) Plaintiffs' Proposed Schedule submitted herewith as Exhibit A  
3 and (b) Defendants' Proposed Schedule submitted herewith as Exhibit B.

4 **b. Defendants' additional statement**

5 In a related case in another jurisdiction, Defendants filed one motion to extend time to answer  
6 or otherwise respond which was granted in part and denied in part. *Hotard v. Netflix, Inc.*, CV-09-  
7 1938 (E.D. La.)(Dkt. No. 13). The Eastern District of Louisiana granted Defendants a 60-day  
8 extension of time to answer or otherwise respond.

9  
10 **5. AMENDMENT OF PLEADINGS**

11 **a. Plaintiffs' Statement**

12 Plaintiffs intend to file a Consolidated Amended Complaint.

13 **b. Defendants' Statement**

14 Defendants will determine how to respond to Plaintiffs' Consolidated Amended Complaint  
15 once it is filed; Plaintiffs have stipulated that Defendants may defer their response until after the  
16 Consolidated Amended Complaint is filed.

17  
18 **6. EVIDENCE PRESERVATION**

19 **a. Plaintiffs' Statement**

20 Plaintiffs' counsel have notified their clients of their preservation obligations under law. As  
21 Plaintiffs are individual consumers whose most relevant records are maintained by one or more  
22 Defendants, it is Defendants' preservation efforts that are of paramount importance. To effectuate the  
23 preservation of all documents that could be reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible  
24 evidence in the actions, Plaintiffs intend to negotiate a proposed preservation order with Defendants  
25 for submission to the Court.

26 **b. Defendants' Statement**

27 Defendants have instituted litigation holds in order to preserve documents related to the  
28 litigation or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants

1 respectfully suggest that plaintiffs have not shown any cause for believing that any party to this case  
2 will refuse to honor its document retention obligations and believe, therefore, that there is no need to  
3 supplement those obligations with a document preservation order.  
4

5 **7. DISCLOSURES**

6 **a. Plaintiffs' Statement**

7 The parties have not yet exchanged initial disclosures under Fed. R. Civ. P. 26. Plaintiffs'  
8 proposed timing for the exchange of such disclosures is set forth in Exhibit A.

9 **b. Defendants' Statement**

10 The parties have not yet exchanged initial disclosures under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure  
11 26, and propose that the Court adopt the timing for the exchange of such disclosures set forth in the  
12 attached Exhibit B.  
13

14 **8. DISCOVERY**

15 **a. Plaintiffs' Statement**

16 In accordance with the Court's Order of February 2, 2009, the parties held Rule 26(f)  
17 conferences on March 18, 2009 and March 20, 2009. There has been no discovery taken to date. As  
18 reflected in Exhibit A, Plaintiffs have proposed dates for fact and expert discovery in this matter.  
19 Discovery of the proposed class representatives should be minimal, while discovery of the corporate  
20 Defendants, as well as third parties, may be substantial. Plaintiffs do not believe discovery should be  
21 limited, other than as provided for by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Court's Civil Local  
22 Rules, except that 1) each side shall be limited to a total of 45 fact depositions of the Parties, without  
23 leave of Court, and 2) that any four depositions of each of the Defendants may be extended to a  
24 duration of 14 hours each, without leave of Court.

25 Plaintiffs do not believe that discovery should be divided in the atypical manner proposed by  
26 Defendants. As reflected in Exhibit B, Defendants seek to divide discovery into "class" and "merits"  
27 and further subdivide "merits" discovery between the issue of agreement (phase 1) and other remaining  
28 issues (phase 2). This multi-tiered discovery scheme would unreasonably protract discovery, including

1 deposing some witnesses twice, and substantially delay the ultimate disposition of this case. There is  
2 no bright line distinction between issues of class certification, the existence of the agreement and the  
3 impact/damages from the agreement. For example, as shown by Defendants' Statement, Wal-Mart's  
4 allegedly weak competitive position is a key basis for Defendants' theory that Wal-Mart's exit from  
5 the market was unilateral and not a result of an agreement with Netflix, which would be an issue in  
6 Defendants' first discovery phase. But, Wal-Mart's competitive significance is also a key element on  
7 issues of the impact/damages from Wal-Mart's exit, which is the heart of Defendants' second  
8 discovery phase.

9 Defendants also schedule at least two rounds of motions for summary judgment, with a stay of  
10 all proceedings pending resolution of the first round of summary judgment motions, which would  
11 further delay matters with no concomitant benefit, as Plaintiffs have alleged *per se*, rule of reason, and  
12 monopolization theories. Defendants' proposal could add years to the schedule relative to Plaintiffs'  
13 proposal. Defendants' request to divide initial disclosures in a corresponding way would compound  
14 these problems.

15 **b. Defendants' Statement**

16 Plaintiffs have alleged that Defendants entered into a *per se* illegal agreement to divide the  
17 markets for online DVD rentals and DVD sales. That allegation presents a threshold issue which  
18 Defendants believe can and should be resolved through an initial fact discovery period and an early  
19 motion for summary judgment that would proceed in parallel with class certification proceedings.  
20 Contrary to plaintiffs' statement, defendants' proposal would not lead to duplicative discovery or  
21 substantial delay.

22 The early summary judgment phase that defendants propose would not, as plaintiffs contend,  
23 focus on whether the joint promotion agreement was an agreement, or on Wal-Mart's "weak  
24 competitive position"; rather, the initial phase of fact discovery and summary judgment proceedings  
25 would focus narrowly on the issue of whether defendants entered into a *per se* illegal "Market Division  
26 Agreement" as plaintiffs have alleged, *i.e.*, an agreement whereby Wal-Mart agreed to exit the market  
27 for online DVD rentals in exchange for an agreement by Netflix not to compete in the market for DVD  
28 sales. Whether that alleged agreement did or did not exist is a narrow and limited question that does

1 not require the broader consideration of issues such as market definition, competition, or pricing that  
2 would be relevant under the rule of reason.

3 Defendants' proposal also would not lead to duplicative discovery. Under defendants'  
4 proposal, plaintiffs would have the opportunity to depose the witnesses who are knowledgeable about  
5 the joint promotion agreement during the initial discovery phase; because any additional discovery  
6 phase would focus more broadly on issues such as the nature of the markets in which defendants  
7 compete, defendants' business decision making with respect to DVD rentals and DVD sales, and  
8 defendants' pricing and pricing decisions, and because the depositions during the initial discovery  
9 phase would have already covered issues relating to the joint promotion agreement itself, there would  
10 be little or no need to again depose those witnesses who are knowledgeable about the joint promotion  
11 agreement. Thus, while defendants' proposed early summary judgment motion may eliminate the need  
12 for broad and burdensome discovery if it is successful in disposing of plaintiffs' claims, it will not  
13 require duplicative discovery.

14 Accordingly, as set forth in Exhibit B, Defendants have proposed a phased discovery and pre-  
15 trial motion schedule under which the case would proceed in the following phases: (1) an initial phase  
16 of discovery related to class certification issues and to fact discovery concerning Plaintiffs' allegation  
17 of a *per se* illegal market division arrangement; (2) expert discovery and briefing relating to Plaintiffs'  
18 motion for class certification and an early motion for summary judgment relating to the alleged *per se*  
19 violation; (3) additional fact discovery relating to market definition, competitive effects, damages, and  
20 other remaining issues; and (4) expert discovery relating to those remaining issues.

21 Defendants also believe that plaintiffs' request to take up to forty-five party depositions, an  
22 unspecified number of third-party depositions, and up to four two-day depositions, is excessive.  
23 Instead, defendants propose that during the initial phase of discovery, each side would be limited to no  
24 more than 10 fact depositions. During the additional discovery phase, if the case is not disposed of as  
25 a result of the early summary judgment proceedings, each side would be permitted to take an  
26 additional 15 depositions, for a total of 25 depositions per side. Either side would be permitted to seek  
27 additional depositions for good cause following a meet and confer with the opposing side, which  
28

1 should take place after the parties have served their initial disclosures. No deposition could exceed the  
2 seven hours permitted under Rule 30 absent agreement of the other side or for good cause shown.

3 Defendants anticipate that issues relating to e-discovery and document production will require  
4 significant attention. So that any issues may be identified as soon as possible, Defendants have  
5 proposed that requests for production be served at the beginning of the fact discovery periods.  
6

## 7 **9. CLASS ACTIONS**

### 8 **a. Plaintiffs' Statement**

9 These actions are brought as class actions. In accordance with Civil Local Rule 16-9(b) and  
10 without prejudice to extending, revising or amending the following, Plaintiffs state:

11 1. Plaintiffs bring the actions on their own behalf and as class actions under Rules  
12 23(a), 23(b)(2), and 23(b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure on behalf of all members of the  
13 proposed Class, defined as:

14 Any person in the United States that paid a subscription fee to Netflix to  
15 rent DVDs, on or after May 19, 2005 up to the present. Excluded  
16 from the Class are government entities, Defendants, their co-  
17 conspirators and their representatives, parents, subsidiaries, and  
affiliates.

18 2. The Class numbers in the millions, the exact number and identities of the members  
19 being known by Defendants.

20 3. The Class is so numerous and geographically dispersed that joinder of all members is  
21 impracticable.

22 4. There are questions of law and fact common to the Class and the members  
23 thereof. These common questions relate to the existence of the conspiracy alleged, and to the type  
24 and common pattern of injuries sustained as a result thereof.

25 5. The questions of law and fact common to members of the Class predominate over any  
26 questions affecting only individual members, including the legal and factual issues relating to  
27 liability and damages.  
28

1           6.       Plaintiffs are members of the Class. Their claims are typical of the claims of  
2 other members of the Class, and they will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the members of  
3 the Class. Their interests are aligned with, and not antagonistic to, those of the other members of the  
4 Class.

5           7.       Plaintiffs are represented by competent counsel who are experienced in class action  
6 antitrust litigation.

7           8.       A class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and efficient  
8 adjudication of this controversy. Class treatment will permit the adjudication of relatively small  
9 claims by members of the Class who otherwise could not afford to litigate antitrust claims such as  
10 are asserted in this Complaint. This class action presents no difficulties of management that would  
11 preclude its maintenance as a class action.

12           9.       Defendants have acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the Class,  
13 thereby making appropriate final injunctive relief or corresponding declaratory relief with respect to  
14 the Class as a whole.

15           10.      The Plaintiffs' proposed schedule for class certification practice is set forth in Exhibit  
16 A.

17           **b.       Defendants' Statement**

18           Defendants do not admit the legal conclusions as to the propriety of class certification pursuant  
19 to Rule 23(a), (b)(2), and (b)(3) contained in Plaintiffs' Statement and expect to litigate these issues at  
20 class certification. Defendants' proposed pre-trial schedule, which includes a proposed schedule for  
21 class certification briefing, is included in Exhibit B.

22  
23           **10.      RELATED CASES**

24           **Joint Statement**

25           All cases filed within the Northern District of California are pending before this Court. A  
26 schedule of related cases pending in other jurisdictions is submitted herewith as Exhibit C. There are  
27 several cases that have been removed to this Court by Defendants from Santa Clara County Superior  
28



1 Court, as set forth in Item 1, above. As noted above, there is a proceeding pending before the Judicial  
2 Panel on Multidistrict Litigation as set forth in Item 14, below.

3  
4 **11. RELIEF**

5 **a. Plaintiffs' Statement**

6 Plaintiffs seek treble damages, attorneys' fees and costs, and injunctive relief for Defendants'  
7 violations of law. The precise amount of damages sought and the bases on which such damages will  
8 be calculated are not yet known.

9 **b. Defendants' Statement**

10 Defendants deny that Plaintiffs are entitled to any of the relief sought.

11  
12 **12. SETTLEMENT AND ADR**

13 **a. Plaintiffs' Statement**

14 Plaintiffs believe there is a realistic possibility of settling the case and would welcome  
15 commencement of a settlement dialogue with any Defendant. Plaintiffs also believe that, at an  
16 appropriate time, this case could benefit from ADR. However, it is premature to commence ADR  
17 before Plaintiffs have taken at least some discovery.

18 **b. Defendants' Statement**

19 Defendants believe that discussion of settlement or ADR is premature at this time..

20  
21 **13. CONSENT TO MAGISTRATE JUDGE FOR ALL PURPOSES**

22 **a. Plaintiffs' Statement**

23 Plaintiffs do not consent.

24 **b. Defendants' Statement**

25 Defendants do not consent.

26  
27 **14. OTHER REFERENCES**

28 **Joint Statement**

1 A proceeding is pending before the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation. The matter has  
2 been fully briefed and oral argument was heard on March 26, 2009. All parties agree that the cases  
3 from this Court and the other federal district courts should be consolidated and that it is virtually  
4 certain that the Panel will order such consolidation.  
5

6 **15. NARROWING OF ISSUES**

7 **a. Plaintiffs' Statement**

8 Plaintiffs believe there is no prospect that this case will be resolved on summary judgment, as  
9 Plaintiffs will have sufficient evidence to take their case to a jury. There may well be summary  
10 dismissal of such affirmative defenses as may be asserted by Defendants. Plaintiffs' proposed dates  
11 for the filing of dispositive motions and/or cross motions, oppositions, and replies are set forth in  
12 Exhibit A.

13 **b. Defendants' Statement**

14 Defendants believe that these cases can be adjudicated, or at least substantially narrowed or  
15 clarified, through limited fact discovery and an early summary judgment motion relating to the  
16 existence of the *per se* illegal market division agreement alleged in the complaint. If, as Defendants  
17 maintain, the joint promotion agreement was not a naked restraint of trade but, rather, an arrangement  
18 akin to a merger or joint venture associated with procompetitive efficiencies, there would be no basis  
19 for the *per se* claim alleged in the complaint. Defendants would then prevail on the merits, or  
20 Plaintiffs would be required to pursue a theory of liability under the rule of reason that they have not  
21 yet alleged. Resolving that issue through an early summary judgment motion could eliminate the need  
22 for extensive fact discovery relating to issues such as market definition, the competitive effects of the  
23 alleged agreement, and damages. If Defendants do not prevail on their early summary judgment  
24 motion, Defendants would anticipate bringing one or more additional summary judgment motions  
25 following the close of discovery.  
26  
27  
28

1 **16. EXPEDITED SCHEDULE**

2 **a. Plaintiffs' Statement**

3 Plaintiffs do not believe that these actions are susceptible to an expedited schedule.

4 **b. Defendants' Statement**

5 Defendants do not believe that these actions are susceptible to an expedited schedule.

6  
7  
8 **17. SCHEDULING**

9 **a. Plaintiffs' Statement**

10 Plaintiffs' proposed dates for designation of experts, discovery cutoff, hearing of dispositive  
11 motions, and a pretrial conference are set forth in Exhibit A.

12 **b. Defendants' Statement**

13 Defendants proposed dates are set forth in Exhibit B.

14  
15 **18. TRIAL**

16 **a. Plaintiffs' Statement**

17 Plaintiffs demand trial by jury. Plaintiffs believe they will have sufficient evidence to take their  
18 case to a jury. A proposed time for trial is set forth in Exhibit A.

19 **b. Defendants' Statement**

20 As set forth in the proposed schedule set forth in Exhibit B, Defendants anticipate that a trial of  
21 these cases would require 20 seven-hour trial days.

22  
23 **19. DISCLOSURE OF NON-PARTY INTERESTED ENTITIES OR PERSONS**

24 **a. Plaintiffs' Statement**

25 Plaintiffs all have filed a "Certification of Interested Entities or Persons" required by Civil  
26 Local Rule 3-16. Plaintiffs hereby restate that other than those persons or entities disclosed by  
27 Defendants, there are no other persons, firms, partnerships, corporations (including parent  
28 corporations) or other entities known by the party to have either: (i) a financial interest in the subject

1 matter in controversy or in a party to the proceeding; or (ii) any other kind of interest that could be  
2 substantially affected by the outcome of the proceeding.

3       **b. Defendants' Statement**

4 Defendants have each filed a "Certificate of Interested Entities."

5 Defendant Netflix, Inc. reiterates that it has no parent corporation, that no publicly held  
6 corporation owns more than 10% of its stock, and that, other than the parties, it knows of no other  
7 person or entity with an interest in the outcome.

8 Defendant Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. reiterates that it has no parent corporation, that no publicly  
9 held corporation owns more than 10% of its stock, and that, other than the parties, it knows of no other  
10 person or entity with an interest in the outcome.

11 Defendant Walmart.com USA LLC reiterates that it is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Wal-Mart  
12 Stores, Inc., that no publicly held corporation owns more than 10% of the stock of Wal-Mart Stores  
13 Inc., and that Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. and its wholly owned subsidiaries have an interest in the outcome.

14  
15 **20. OTHER MATTERS AS MAY FACILITATE THE JUST, SPEEDY AND**  
16 **INEXPENSIVE DISPOSITION OF THIS MATTER**

17       **a. Plaintiffs' Statement**

18 Plaintiffs incorporate by reference Items 8, 12 and 15 above.

19       **b. Defendants' Statement**

20 Defendants incorporate by reference Parts 8 and 15 above.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 DATED: April 2, 2009

2 Respectfully Submitted,

3 Robert G. Abrams  
4 Thomas A. Isaacson  
5 Peter A. Barile III  
6 HOWREY LLP  
7 1299 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
8 Washington, DC 20004  
9 Tel.: (202) 783-0800  
10 Fax: (202) 383-6610

11 Paul Alexander  
12 HOWREY LLP  
13 1950 University Avenue  
14 East Palo Alto, CA 94303  
15 Tel.: (650) 798-3500  
16 Fax: (650) 798-3600

17 Emily L. Maxwell  
18 HOWREY LLP  
19 525 Market Street, Suite 3600  
20 San Francisco, CA 94105  
21 Tel.: (415) 848-4947  
22 Fax: (415) 848-4999

23 BY: s/ Robert G. Abrams

24 *Counsel for Plaintiffs*

25 Resnick, et al. v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al., Case No.  
26 3:09-cv-00002

27 - and in the following related cases -

28 O'Connor v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al.,  
Case No. 3:09-cv-00096  
Anthony, et al. v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al.,  
Case No. 3:09-cv-00236  
Sheeler, Jr. v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al.,  
Case No. 3:09-cv-00274  
Meyer v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al.,  
Case No. 3:09-cv-00361  
Johnson v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al., 3:09-cv-00553  
Gannon v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al.,  
Case No. 3:09-cv-00554

1 -and attests in accordance with General Order No. 45 X. B.  
2 that concurrence in the filing of the document has been  
3 obtained from each of the undersigned counsel in all of the  
4 above-captioned actions

5 **Defendants' Counsel**

6 Jonathan M. Jacobson  
7 Sara Ciarelli Walsh  
8 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI, PC  
9 1301 Avenue of the Americas  
10 40th Floor  
11 New York, NY 10019  
12 Tel.: (212) 999-5800  
13 Fax: (212) 999-5899

14 Keith E. Eggleton  
15 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI  
16 650 Page Mill Road  
17 Palo Alto, Ca 94304-1050  
18 Tel: (650) 493-9300  
19 Fax: (650) 565-5100

20 Scott Andrew Sher  
21 WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI  
22 1700 K Street, NW, Fifth Floor  
23 Washington, DC 20006  
24 Tel: (202) 973-8800  
25 Fax: (202) 973-8899  
26 *Counsel for Defendant Netflix, Inc.*

27 Neal Manne  
28 Richard Wolf Hess  
SUSMAN GODFREY LLP  
1000 Louisiana Street, Suite 5100  
Houston, Texas 77002  
Tel: (713) 651-9366  
Fax: (713) 654-6666

Genevieve Vose  
SUSMAN GODFREY LLP  
1201 Third Ave., Suite 3800  
Seattle, WA 98101-3000  
Tel: (206) 516-3836  
Fax: (206-516-3883

Stephen E. Morrissey  
Kathryn Parsons Hoek  
Marc M. Seltzer

SUSMAN GODFREY LLP  
1901 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 950  
Los Angeles, CA 90067-6029  
Tel.: 310-789-3100  
Fax: 310-789-3150

*Counsel for Defendant Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. and Walmart.com USA LLC*

**Plaintiffs' Counsel in each of the  
above captioned related cases**

Eugene A. Spector  
Jeffrey J. Corrigan  
Theodore M. Lieverman  
Jay S. Cohen  
Jonathan M. Jagher  
SPECTOR ROSEMAN KODROFF  
& WILLIS, P.C.  
1818 Market Street, Suite 2500  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
Tel.: (215) 496-0300  
Fax: (215) 496-6611

*Counsel for Plaintiffs*

O'Connor v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al., Case No. C 09-0096 PJH  
Sheeler, Jr. v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al., Case No. C 09-0274 PJH  
Meyer v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al., Case No. C 09-0361 PJH  
Johnson v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al. Case No. C 09-00553 PJH  
Gannon v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al.,  
Case No. 3:09-cv-00554

Natalie Finkelman Bennett  
SHEPHERD, FINKELMAN, MILLER,  
SHAH, LLP  
35 East State Street  
Media, PA 19063  
Tel.: (610) 891-9880  
Fax: (610) 891-9883

Gary E. Mason  
Donna F. Solen  
THE MASON LAW FIRM LLP  
1225 19th Street, N.W., Suite 500

1 Washington, DC 20036  
2 Tel.: (202) 429-2290  
3 Fax: (202) 429-2294

4 *Counsel for Plaintiff*

5 O'Connor v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al., Case No. C 09-  
6 0096 PJH

7 Joseph J. Tabacco, Jr.  
8 Christopher T. Heffelfinger  
9 Todd A. Seaver  
10 BERMAN DEVALERIO  
11 425 California Street, Suite 2100  
12 San Francisco, CA 94104  
13 Tel.: (415) 433-3200  
14 Fax: (415) 433-6382

15 Manuel J. Dominguez  
16 BERMAN DEVALERIO  
17 4280 Professional Center Drive, Suite 350  
18 Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33410  
19 Tel: (561) 835-9400  
20 Fax: (561) 835-0322

21 *Counsel for Plaintiffs*

22 Endzweig v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al., Case No. C 09-  
23 0111 PJH

24 Lynch, et al. v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al., Case No. C  
25 09-0138 PJH

26 Bruno, et al. v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al. Case No. C  
27 09-00445 PJH

28 H. Laddie Montague, Jr.  
Merrill G. Davidoff  
David F. Sorensen  
Peter Kohn  
BERGER & MONTAGUE, P.C.  
1622 Locust Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
Tel.: (215) 875-3010  
Fax: (215) 875-4604

Vahn Alexander  
FARUQI & FARUQI, LLP  
1901 Avenue of the Stars, 2nd Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90067  
Tel.: (310) 461-1426



1 Fax: (310) 461-1427

2 Kendall S. Zylstra  
3 Richard Schwartz  
4 FARUQI & FARUQI, LLP  
5 2600 Philmont Avenue, Suite 324  
6 Huntingdon Valley, PA 19006  
7 Tel.: (215) 914-2460  
8 Fax: (215) 914-2462

9 *Counsel for Plaintiffs*

10 Schmitz v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al., Case No. C 09-  
11 0116 PJH

12 Sivek v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al., Case No. C 09-0156  
13 PJH

14 Daniel A. Small  
15 Benjamin D. Brown  
16 Kit Pierson  
17 Christopher Cormier  
18 COHEN MILSTEIN SELLERS & TOLL PPLC  
19 1100 New York Avenue, N.W.  
20 Suite 500, West Tower  
21 Washington, DC 20005  
22 Tel.: (202) 838-7797  
23 Fax: (202) 838-7745

24 *Counsel for Plaintiffs*

25 Lynch, et al. v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al., Case No. C  
26 09-0138 PJH

27 Bryan L. Clobes  
28 Ellen Meriwether  
Timothy Fraser  
CAFFERTY FAUCHER LLP  
1717 Arch Street, Ste., 3610  
Philadelphia, PA 19103

Nyran Rose Pearson  
CAFFERTY FAUCHER LLP  
30 N. LaSalle Street, Suite 3200  
Chicago IL 60602

*Counsel for Plaintiffs*

Groce, et al. v. Netflix, Inc., et al., Case No. C 09-0139 PJH

Kevin Bruce Love  
Michael E. Criden  
CRIDEN & LOVE, P.A.  
7301 S.W. 57 h Court, Suite 515  
South Miami, FL 33143

*Counsel for Plaintiff*

Faris v. Netflix, Inc., et al., Case No. C 09-0180 PJH

Daniel E. Girard  
Elizabeth C. Pritzker  
GIRARD GIBBS LLP  
601 California Street, Suite 1400  
San Francisco, CA 94180

*Counsel for Plaintiffs*

Groce, et al. v. Netflix, Inc., et al., Case No. C 09-0139 PJH  
Faris v. Netflix, Inc., et al., Case No. C 09-0180 PJH  
Polk-Stamps v. Netflix, Inc., et al., Case No. C 09-0244 PJH

Robert C. Schubert  
Willem F. Jonckheer  
SCHUBERT JONCKHEER KOLBE &  
KRALOWEC LLP  
Three Embarcadero Center, Suite 1650  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
Tel.: (415) 788-4220  
Fax: (415) 788-0161

*Counsel for Plaintiffs*

Slobodin v. Netflix, Inc., et al., Case No. C 09-0225 PJH  
Landels, et al. v. Netflix, Inc., et al., Case No. C 09-0340 PJH  
Melanie Miscioscia v. Netflix, Inc., et al., Case No. C 09-0377  
PJH  
James Chatelain v. Netflix, Inc., et al., Case No. C 09-0391  
PJH

Judith L. Spanier  
Jill S. Abrams  
Natalie Marcus  
ABBIE SPANIER RODD & ABRAMS, LLP  
212 East 39th Street  
New York, New York 10016  
Tel.: (212) 889-3700  
Fax: (212) 684-5191

Craig H. Blinderman  
MREJEN BLINDERMAN, P.L.  
701 West Cypress Creek Road, Suite 302  
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33309  
Tel.: (954) 771-3740  
Fax: (954) 771-3047

*Counsel for Plaintiffs*

Anthony, et al. v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al., Case No. C  
09-0236 PJH

Mary Jane Fait  
Theodore T. Bell  
John E. Tangren  
WOLF HALDENSTEIN ADLER FREEMAN & HERZ LLC  
55 West Monroe Street, Suite 1111  
Chicago, IL 60603

*Counsel for Plaintiffs*

Polk-Stamps v. Netflix, Inc., et al., Case No. C 09-0244 PJH

Lee Albert  
Brian Brooks  
Jacqueline Sailer  
MURRAY, FRANK & SAILER LLP  
275 Madison Avenue, Suite 801  
New York, New York 10016  
Tel.: (212) 682-1818  
Fax: (212) 682-1892

*Counsel for Plaintiff*

Sheeler, Jr. v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al., Case No. C  
09-0274 PJH

Michael F. Ram  
Erica Craven-Green  
LEVY, RAM & OLSON LLP  
639 Front Street, 4th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
Tel.: (415) 433-4949  
Fax: (415) 433-7311

*Counsel for Plaintiff*

Chapman v. Netflix, Inc., et al., Case No. C 09-0294 PJH

Alex C. Turan  
MONTURA LAW GROUP  
2070 N. Broadway, Suite 5492  
Walnut Creek, CA 94596  
Tel.: (415) 308-0025  
Fax: (925) 256-9615

*Counsel for Plaintiff*

Orozco v. Netflix, Inc., et al., Case No. C 09-0297 PJH

Guy A. Wilson  
LAW OFFICES OF GUY A. WILSON  
509 Orchard Street  
Santa Rosa, CA 95404  
Tel.: (707) 525-1277

Roy A. Katriel  
THE KATRIEL LAW FIRM  
1101 30th Street  
Washington, DC 20007  
Tel.: (202) 625-4342

*Counsel for Plaintiffs*

Landels, et al. v. Netflix, Inc., et al., Case No. C 09-0340 PJH

Guido Saveri  
R. Alexander Saveri  
Melissa Shapiro  
Cadio Zirpoli  
SAVERI & SAVERI, INC.  
706 Sansome Street  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
Tel.: (415) 217-6810  
Fax: (415) 217-6813

*Counsel for Plaintiff*

Grime v. Netflix, Inc., et al., Case No. C 09-0349 PJH

Marc H. Edelson  
EDELSON & ASSOCIATES, LLC  
45 West Court Street  
Doylestown, PA 18901  
Tel.: (215) 230-8043  
Fax: (215) 230-8735

1 *Counsel for Plaintiff*

2 Meyer v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al., Case No. C 09-0361  
3 PJH

4 Linda P. Nussbaum  
5 KAPLAN, FOX & KILSHEIMER, LLP  
6 850 Third Avenue, 14th Floor  
7 New York, NY 10022  
8 Tel.: (212) 680-1980  
9 Fax: (212) 687-7714

10 Laurence D. King  
11 Linda M. Fong  
12 KAPLAN, FOX & KILSHEIMER, LLP  
13 350 Sansome Street, Suite 400  
14 San Francisco, CA 94104  
15 Tel.: (415) 772-4700  
16 Fax: (415) 772-4707

17 *Counsel for Plaintiff*

18 Randall v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al., Case No. C 09-  
19 0368 PJH

20 Harry Shulman  
21 THE MILLS LAW FIRM  
22 880 Las Gallinas Avenue, Suite 2  
23 San Rafael, CA 94903  
24 Tel.: 415-455-1326  
25 Fax: 415-455-1327

26 Douglas A. Millen  
27 FREED KANNER LONDON & MILLEN, LLC  
28 2201 Waukegan Road, Suite 130  
Bannockburn, IL 60015  
Tel.: (224) 632-4500  
Fax.: (224) 632-4521

*Counsel for Plaintiff*

Hirsch v. Netflix, Inc., et al., Case No. C 09-0375 PJH

David Pastor  
GILMAN & PASTOR, LLP  
63 Atlantic Avenue, Third Floor  
Boston, MA 02110  
Tel.: (617) 742-9700

1 Michael F. Germano  
2 LAW OFFICES OF MICHAEL GERMANO, P.C.  
3 63 Atlantic Avenue, Third Floor  
4 Boston, MA 02110  
5 Tel.: (617) 367-5911

6 *Counsel for Plaintiff*

7 Melanie Miscioscia v. Netflix, Inc., et al., Case No. C 09-0377  
8 PJH

9 Mark Warshaw  
10 Jaquelynn Pope  
11 WARSHAW & POPE  
12 934 Hermosa Avenue, Suite 14  
13 Hermosa Beach, CA 90254  
14 Tel.: (310) 379-3410

15 Edward F. Haber  
16 SHAPIRO HABER & URMY  
17 53 State Street  
18 Boston, MA 02109  
19 Tel.: (617) 439-3939

20 *Counsel for Plaintiff*

21 James Chatelain v. Netflix, Inc., et al., Case No. C 09-0391  
22 PJH

23 Richard M. Volin  
24 Michael McLellan  
25 FINKELSTEIN THOMPSON LLP  
26 1050 30th Street, N.W.  
27 Washington, DC 20007  
28 Tel.: (202) 337-8000  
Fax: (202) 337-8090

Rosemary M. Rivas  
Mark Punzalan  
FINKELSTEIN THOMPSON LLP  
100 Bush Street, Suite 1450  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
Tel.: (415) 398-8700  
Fax: (415) 398-8704

Gordon M. Fauth, Jr.  
LITIGATION LAW GROUP  
1801 Clement Avenue, Suite 101  
Alameda, CA 94501

1 Tel.: (510) 238-9610

2 Fax: (510) 337-1431

3 *Counsel for Plaintiff*

4 Patras v. Netflix, Inc., et al., Case No. C 09-00378 PJH

5 Anthony J. Bolognese

6 Joshua H. Grabar

7 BOLOGNESE & ASSOCIATES, LLC

8 Two Penn Center

9 1500 JFK Boulevard, Suite 320

10 Philadelphia, PA 19102

11 Tel.: (215) 814-6750

12 Fax: (215) 814-6764

13 *Counsel for Plaintiff*

14 Weiner v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al., Case No. C 09-  
15 00398 PJH

16 Gerald J. Rodos

17 Jeffrey B. Gittleman

18 Julie B. Palley

19 BARRACK, RODOS & BACINE

20 3300 Two Commerce Square

21 2001 Market Street

22 Philadelphia, PA 19130

23 Tel.: (215) 963-0600

24 Fax: (215) 963-0838

25 Steve R. Basser

26 BARRACK, RODOS & BACINE

27 One American Plaza

28 600 West Broadway, Suite 900

San Diego, CA 92101

Tel.: (619) 230-0800

Fax: (619) 230-1874

*Counsel for Plaintiff*

Millrood v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al. Case No. C 09-  
00399 PJH

Frank J. Johnson

Francis A. Bottini, Jr.

JOHNSON BOTTINI, LLP

655 West Broadway, Suite 1400

San Diego, CA 92101

1 Tel.: (619) 230-0063  
2 Fax: (619) 233-5535

3 *Counsel for Plaintiff*

4 Kober v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al. Case No. C 09-  
5 00400 PJH

6 Joseph Saveri  
7 Michele C. Jackson  
8 Eric B. Fastiff  
9 Andrew S. Kingsdale  
10 LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN  
11 & BERNSTEIN, LLP  
12 275 Battery Street, Suite 3000  
13 San Francisco, CA 94111  
14 Tel.: (415) 956-1000  
15 Fax: (415) 956-1008

16 *Counsel for Plaintiff*

17 Lacabe v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al. Case No. C 09-  
18 00402 PJH

19 Bruce L. Simon  
20 Jonathan M. Watkins  
21 PEARSON, SIMON, SOTER, WARSHAW  
22 & PENNY, LLP  
23 44 Montgomery Street, Suite 1430  
24 San Francisco, CA 94104  
25 Tel.: (415) 433-9000  
26 Fax: (415) 433-9008

27 *Counsel for Plaintiff*

28 Roy v. Netflix, Inc., et al. Case No. C 09-00434 PJH

Mindee J. Reuben  
WEINSTEIN KITCHENOFF & ASHER, LLC  
1845 Walnut Street, Suite 1100  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
Tel.: (215) 545-7200  
Fax: (215) 535-6535

*Counsel for Plaintiffs*

Bruno, et al. v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al. Case No. C  
09-00445 PJH



Edward A. Wallace  
Kenneth A. Wexler  
WEXLER WALLACE, LLP  
55 West Monroe Street, Suite 3300  
Chicago, IL 60603  
Tel: 312.346.2222  
Fax: 312.346.0022

Mark J. Tamblyn  
Neha Duggal  
WEXLER WALLACE, LLP  
455 Capitol Mall, Suite 231  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
Tel.: 916-492-1100  
Fax: 916-492-1124

*Counsel for Plaintiff*

Zaker v. Netflix, Inc., et al. Case No. C 09-00447 PJH

Bonny E. Sweeney  
David W. Mitchell  
COUGHLIN STOIA GELLER RUDMAN &  
ROBBINS LLP  
655 West Broadway, Suite 1900  
San Diego, CA 92101  
Tel.: (619) 231-1058  
Fax: (619) 231-7423

William C. Wright  
THE LAW OFFICES OF WILLIAM C.  
WRIGHT, P.A.  
301 Clematis Street, Suite 3000  
West Palm Beach, FL 33401  
Tel.: (561) 514-0904  
Fax: (561) 514-0905

*Counsel for Plaintiff*

Parikh v. Netflix, Inc., et al. Case No. C 09-00496 PJH

Garrett D. Blanchfield  
REINHARDT, WENDORF & BLANCHFIELD  
E1250 First National Bank Building  
332 Minnesota Street  
St. Paul, MN 55101  
Tel.: (651) 287-2100  
Fax: (651) 287-2103

1 *Counsel for Plaintiff*

2 Johnson v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al. Case No. C 09-  
3 00553 PJH

4 David P. McLafferty  
5 McLAFFERTY & ASSOCIATES, P.C.  
6 923 Fayette Street  
7 Conshohocken, PA 19428  
8 Tel.: (610) 940-4000  
9 Fax: (610) 940-4007

10 *Counsel for Plaintiff*

11 Gannon v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al. Case No. C 09-  
12 00554 PJH

13 Dianne M. Nast  
14 Joseph F. Roda  
15 Michele S. Burkholder  
16 Daniel N. Gallucci  
17 RODANAST, P.C.  
18 801 Estelle Drive  
19 Lancaster, Pennsylvania 17601  
20 Telephone: (717) 892-3000  
21 Facsimile: (717) 892-1200

22 *Counsel for Plaintiff*

23 Williams v. Netflix, Inc., et al. Case No. C 09-00678 PJH

24 Edward M. Gergosian  
25 Robert J. Gralewski  
26 William D. Harris  
27 GERGOSIAN & GRALEWSKI LLP  
28 655 West Broadway Suite 1410  
San Diego CA 92101  
Tel 619-237-9500  
Fax 619-237-9555 fax

*Counsel for Plaintiff*

Haddad v. Netflix, Inc., et al., Case No. C-09-00958 PJH

Matthew Schultz (220641)  
Timothy D. Battin  
Thomas M. Palumbo  
STRAUS & BOIES, LLP  
4041 University Drive, 5th Floor

Fairfax, Virginia 22030  
Tel: (703) 764-8700  
Fax: (703) 764-8704

*Counsel for Plaintiff*

Wiebe v. Netflix, Inc., et al., Case No. 09-01274 PJH

**California Cartwright Act State Court Plaintiffs**

William Audet  
Aaron Darsky  
Adel Nadji  
AUDET & PARTNERS, LLP  
221 Main Street, Suite 1460  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Tel 415.568.2555  
Fax 415.568.2556

*Counsel for Plaintiff*

Norem v. Netflix, Inc., et al. Case No. C-09-00956 PJH

Thomas M. Ferlauto  
KING & FERLAUTO, LLP  
1880 Century Park East, Suite 820  
Los Angeles, CA 90067  
Tel 310-552-3366  
Fax 310.552.3289

*Counsel for Plaintiff*

Cornett v. Netflix, Inc., et al., Case No. C 09 00960 PJH

Mark E. Burton, Jr.  
HERSH & HERSH, P.C.  
601 Van Ness Ave., Suite 2080  
San Francisco, CA 94102-6388  
Tel 415.441.5544  
Fax 415.441.7586

*Counsel for Plaintiff*

Macias v. Netflix, Inc., et al., Case No. C-09-00961 PJH

Gilbert D. Sigala

LAW OFFICES OF GILBERT D. SIGALA  
1818 W. Beverly Blvd., Suite 206  
Montebello, CA 90640  
Tel 323-726-2150  
Fax 323-726-9183

*Counsel for Plaintiff*

Randle v. Netflix, Inc., et al., Case No. C-09-00962 PJH

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**EXHIBIT A**

**PLAINTIFFS' PROPOSED SCHEDULE**

1. A Consolidated Amended Complaint shall be filed no later than 30 calendar days after the appointment of interim lead counsel and the organizational structure of Plaintiffs' counsel.
2. Initial Disclosures shall be exchanged no later than 7 calendar days after the filing of a Consolidated Amended Complaint.
3. The period for fact discovery shall commence upon the exchange of Initial Disclosures.
4. Defendants shall Answer or otherwise respond to the Consolidated Amended Complaint no later than 30 calendar days subsequent to the filing of the Consolidated Amended Complaint.
5. Plaintiffs shall file a Motion for Class Certification and any accompanying expert disclosures no later than 180 calendar days subsequent to the filing of the Consolidated Amended Complaint.
  - a. Oppositions: +45 calendar days
  - b. Replies: +30 calendar days
6. Parties may be added no later than 30 calendar days prior to the close of Fact Discovery.
7. Fact Discovery shall close 180 calendar days after the filing of the Motion for Class Certification
8. Parties with burden of proof shall make Opening Expert Disclosures under Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(2) no later than 30 calendar days after the close of fact discovery.
  - a. Responsive Expert Disclosures: +30 calendar days
  - b. Rebuttal Expert Disclosures: +15 calendar days
9. Expert discovery shall close 90 calendar days after the close of Fact Discovery.
10. Opening Summary Judgment motions shall be filed no later than 20 calendar days after the close of Expert Discovery.
  - a. Oppositions : +45 calendar days
  - b. Replies: +30 calendar days

1 11. Daubert motions shall be filed no later than 20 calendar days after the close of Expert  
2 Discovery.

3 a. Oppositions : +21 calendar days

4 b. Replies: +12 calendar days

5 12. A Joint Pretrial Statement shall be filed no later than 30 days prior to the Final Pretrial  
6 Conference.

7 13. The Final Pre-Trial Conference shall be held no later than 120 calendar days after the close of  
8 Expert Discovery

9 14. Trial shall begin within 75 calendar days after the Final Pre-Trial Conference is held.

10 a. Trial: 8 calendar days for plaintiffs' affirmative case.

11 b. Post-trial motions shall be filed no later than 30 calendar days after verdict has been  
12 reached.

13 i. Oppositions: +30

14 ii. Replies +15  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**EXHIBIT B**

**DEFENDANTS' PROPOSED SCHEDULE**

1. A Consolidated Amended Complaint shall be filed no later than 30 calendar days after the case management conference or the Order of the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation centralizing this case, whichever is later. At the same time, Plaintiffs' counsel shall move (or submit competing motions) for appointment of class counsel, and for the organization and leadership of the Plaintiffs' counsel.
2. Initial Disclosures shall be exchanged, and the parties shall serve their requests for production of documents relating to class certification issues and to the existence of the alleged *per se* illegal market division agreement, no later than 30 calendar days after the filing of a Consolidated Amended Complaint.
3. The period for discovery relating to (1) the existence of the *per se* illegal market division agreement alleged in the complaints, and (2) class certification, shall commence upon the exchange of Initial Disclosures and continue for 240 calendar days thereafter.
4. Defendants shall Answer or otherwise respond to the Consolidated Amended Complaint no later than 45 calendar days subsequent to the filing of the Consolidated Amended Complaint.
5. Plaintiffs shall make their Rule 26(a)(2) disclosures relating to (1) the existence of the assertedly *per se* illegal market division agreement alleged in the complaints, and (2) class certification within 180 days after the filing of their Consolidated Amended Complaint. Plaintiffs' experts shall be made available for deposition for 30 days after those disclosures. Defendants shall make their Rule 26 disclosures relating to those issues within 45 days after Plaintiffs' disclosures, and shall make their experts available for deposition for 21 days after their disclosures. Plaintiffs' expert rebuttal reports, if any, shall be served within 21 days after Defendants' disclosures, and Plaintiffs shall make their rebuttal witnesses available for deposition for a period of 14 days after serving rebuttal reports.
6. Plaintiffs shall file a Motion for Class Certification no later than 270 calendar days subsequent to the filing of the Consolidated Amended Complaint.

- c. Oppositions: +60 calendar days
- d. Replies: +30 calendar days
7. Defendants may file an early motion for summary judgment no later than 270 days subsequent to the filing of the Consolidated Amended Complaint.
  - a. Oppositions: + 60 days
  - b. Replies: +30 days
8. Additional Fact Discovery to commence upon the latter of the Court's ruling on Plaintiffs' motion for Class Certification or Defendants' early motion for summary judgment
9. Requests for production to be served no later than 30 calendar days after the beginning of the Additional Fact Discovery period.
10. Parties may be added no later than 30 calendar days prior to the close of the Additional Fact Discovery period.
11. Fact Discovery shall close 180 calendar days after the beginning of the Additional Fact Discovery period.
12. Parties with burden of proof shall make Opening Expert Disclosures under Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(2) no later than 30 calendar days after the close of the Additional Fact Discovery.
  - e. Responsive Expert Disclosures: +45 calendar days
  - f. Rebuttal Expert Disclosures: +21 calendar days
13. Expert discovery shall close 90 calendar days after the close of Additional Fact Discovery.
14. Opening Summary Judgment and Daubert motions shall be filed no later than 20 calendar days after the close of Expert Discovery.
  - g. Oppositions: +45 calendar days
  - h. Replies: +30 calendar days
15. A Final Pre-Trial Conference shall be held no later than 120 calendar days after the latter of the close of Expert Discovery or 30 days after the Court's rulings on motions for summary judgment.
  - i. Motions in limine and pretrial memoranda: + 30 calendar days
  - j. Joint Proposed Pretrial Order +30 calendar days



1 16. Trial shall begin within 75 calendar days after filing the Final Pre-Trial Conference.

2 k. Trial: 20 seven-hour trial days to verdict.

3 1. Post-trial motions shall be filed no later than 30 calendar days after verdict has been  
4 reached.

5 i. Oppositions: +30

6 ii. Replies +15  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**EXHIBIT C**

**RELATED CASES PENDING IN OTHER JURISIDCTIONS**

	<b>CASE TITLE</b>	<b>DATE FILED</b>	<b>CASE NO.</b>	<b>DISTRICT</b>
1.	MaGee v. Netflix, Inc., et al.	1/16/09	2:09-cv-00070	Western District of Washington
2.	Michalski, et al. v. Netflix, Inc., et al.	1/23/09	0:09-cv-00158	District of Minnesota
3.	Boynton v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al.	1/27/09	1:09-cv-00026	District of New Hampshire
4.	Mayer v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al.	1/28/09	1:09-cv-00028	District of Vermont
5.	Christina v. Netflix, Inc., et al.	2/2/09	3:09-cv-00059	Middle District of Louisiana
6.	Hotard v. Netflix, Inc., et al.	2/3/09	2:09-cv-01938	Eastern District of Louisiana
7.	Levin v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al.	2/5/09	1:09-cv-00744	Northern District of Illinois
8.	Touchton v. Netflix, Inc., et al.	2/6/09	2:09-cv-00241	Northern District of Alabama
9.	Kopera v. Netflix, Inc., et al.	2/6/09	2:09-cv-00242	Northern District of Alabama
10.	Walters, et al. v. Netflix, Inc., et al.	2/9/09	2:09-cv-00110	Southern District of West Virginia
11.	Karatz v. Netflix, Inc., et al.	2/9/09	1:09-cv-00136	Southern District of Indiana
12.	Bowles v. Netflix, Inc., et al.	2/12/09	8:09-cv-00250	Middle District of Florida
13.	Shafeek v. Netflix, Inc., et al.	2/13/09	1:09-cv-00617	Eastern District of New York
14.	Wagner v. Netflix, Inc., et al.	2/16/09	3:09-cv-00360	Northern District of Ohio
15.	Jones v. Netflix, Inc., et al.	2/17/09	3:09-cv-00131	Southern District of Illinois
16.	Ortiz-Cardona v. Netflix, Inc., et al.	2/18/09	3:09-cv-01157	District of Puerto Rico
18.	Cleary v. Walmart.com USA LLC, et al.	3/5/09	1:09-cv-1383	Northern District of Illinois (Chicago)
19.	Spears v. Netflix, Inc., et al.	3/3/09	0909-ca-05399	Florida State (Hillsborough Circuit Court).

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

3  
4

6

7

8  
9  
10  
11

12

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22  
23  
24